

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 10-13 are pending herein. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended as supported by Fig. 4 of the present application, for example. Claim 8 has been amended in light of the amendment made to claim 7. Claim 13 stands withdrawn.

1. Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 were rejected under §103(a) over Ogura in view of WO 99/22867. To the extent that this rejection may be applied against the amended claims, it is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a method for forming detection spots for analyte detection chips. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the method comprises the steps of providing a plurality of supports arranged in a two-dimensional array, and providing a plurality of injection modules in a two-dimensional array such that an injection module is arranged above each respective support. The method further comprises simultaneously jetting spot-forming liquid from the injection units of each injection module toward the surface of a respective support corresponding to the injection modules in order to simultaneously form detection spots on the surfaces of all supports.

As correctly indicated by the Examiner on page 3 of the present Office Action, Ogura fails to teach or suggest simultaneous spotting on plural substrates. For these features, the Examiner relies on WO '867 for its apparent disclosure of plural injection modules 76, 80, each simultaneously depositing liquid on supports, which "are the rows of rectangular areas shown (Figure 5)" (Office Action mailed April 18, 2006, page 3, lines 10-12). Accordingly, Ogura does not disclose or suggest the inclusion of a plurality of supports arranged in a two-dimensional array.

Each of the injection modules 76, 80 of WO '867 are clearly arranged in a one-dimensional array (i.e., 1×5). Similarly, the plurality of row-shaped supports are one-

dimensional ( $1 \times X$ ). This one-dimensional nature of WO '867 can clearly be seen in Fig. 7 of WO '867. Accordingly, WO '867 does not disclose or suggest the inclusion of a plurality of supports arranged in a two-dimensional array.

For at least the reasons explained above, a method comprising the steps of providing a plurality of supports arranged in a two-dimensional array and providing a plurality of injection modules in a two-dimensional array such that an injection module is arranged above each respective support, as recited in claim 1, would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art given the disclosure of WO '867 and Ogura. Since claims 2, 5 and 6 depend directly from claim 1, those claims are also believed to be allowable over the applied prior art. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

2. Claim 4 was rejected under §103(a) over Ogura in view of WO '867 and further in view of Gamble and/or Hirota. Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments submitted above distinguish claim 1 from Ogura and WO '867. Since Gamble and Hirota do not overcome the deficiencies of Ogura and WO '867, and since claim 4 depends directly from claim 1, claim 4 is also believed to be allowable over the applied art.

3. Claims 7, 8, 11 and 12 were rejected under §103(a) over Ogura in view of WO '867 and further in view of Bass. To the extent that this rejection may be applied against the amended claims, it is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 recites a method for forming detection spots for analyte detection chips. Claim 7 has been amended to clarify that the method comprises the steps of providing a substrate having a plurality of supports joined together in a two-dimensional array, and providing a plurality of injection modules in a two-dimensional array such that an injection module is arranged above each respective support. The

method further comprises simultaneously jetting spot-forming liquid from the injection units of each injection module toward the surface of a respective support corresponding to the injection modules in order to simultaneously form detection spots on the surfaces of all supports.

As discussed in further detail above, Ogura clearly fails to disclose or suggest simultaneous spotting on plural substrates. Also as described in further detail above, WO '867 fails to disclose providing the supports, which are indicated by the Examiner to be the rows of rectangular areas (Fig. 5), in a two-dimensional array. Bass, used by the Examiner only for its apparent disclosure of cutting the substrate to form multiple supports, fails to overcome the deficiencies of Ogura and WO '867.

For at least the reasons stated above, a method comprising the steps of providing a substrate having a plurality of supports joined together in a two-dimensional array and providing a plurality of injection modules in a two-dimensional array such that an injection module is arranged above each respective support of the substrate, as recited in claim 7, would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art given the disclosures of Ogura, WO '867, and Bass. Since claims 8, 11 and 12 depend directly from claim 7, those claims are also believed to be allowable over the applied art. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection are respectfully requested.

4. Claim 10 was rejected under §103(a) over Ogura in view of WO '867, Hirota and/or Gamble, and further in view of Bass. Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments submitted above distinguish claim 7 from Ogura, WO '867 and Bass. Since Hirota and Gamble do not overcome the deficiencies of Ogura, WO '867 and Bass, and since claim 10 depends directly from claim 7, claim 10 is also believed to be allowable over the applied art.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1446.

Page 10 of 10